



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

PROPERTY RIGHTS AND RESOURCE GOVERNANCE PROJECT: ISSUES AND BEST PRACTICES

TRAINING COURSE SUMMARY AND PARTICIPANT EVALUATIONS



OCTOBER 20–22, 2010

This publication was produced for review by the United States Agency for International Development. It was prepared by Tetra Tech ARD.

Prepared for the United States Agency for International Development, USAID Contract Number EPP—
I-00-06-00008-00, Property Rights and Resource Governance (PRRG) Task Order 2 under the
Prosperity, Livelihoods, and Conserving Ecosystems (PLACE) Indefinite Quantity Contract (IQC).
Implemented by:

Tetra Tech ARD
P.O. Box 1397
Burlington, VT 05402

Cover Photo:

Mark Freudenberger presents on how tenure security can promote conservation and the sustainable use
of natural resources.

PROPERTY RIGHTS AND RESOURCE GOVERNANCE PROJECT: ISSUES AND BEST PRACTICE

TRAINING COURSE SUMMARY AND PARTICIPANT
EVALUATIONS

OCTOBER 20–22, 2010

DISCLAIMER

The author's views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the views of the United States Agency for International Development or the United States Government.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	I
ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS	II
PREFACE.....	III
1.0 INTRODUCTION	I
2.0 COURSE OVERVIEW	2
2.1 MODULES	3
2.2 TOOLS	3
2.3 COURSE MATERIALS	4
2.4 COURSE CONTENT	4
3.0 EVALUATION METHODS AND RESULTS	6
APPENDIX A: COURSE ANNOUNCEMENT	8
APPENDIX B: COURSE AGENDA.....	10
APPENDIX C: LIST OF PARTICIPANTS	16
APPENDIX D: PRESENTER BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCHES	20
APPENDIX E: SUMMARY OF PARTICIPANT EVALUATIONS	24

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

COTR	Contracting Officer's Technical Representative
EGAT	Bureau of Economic Growth, Agriculture, and Trade (USAID)
GIS	Geographic Information System
IDP	Internally Displaced Person
IQC	Indefinite Quantity Contract
LMS	Learning Management System
LTPR	Land Tenure and Property Rights
MCC	Millennium Challenge Corporation
NRM	Natural Resources Management
PLACE	Prosperity, Livelihoods, and Conserving Ecosystems
PRRGP	Property Rights and Resource Governance Project
TO	Task Order
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
USG	United States Government

PREFACE

There is a continuing need to understand and communicate how property rights issues change as economies move through various stages of economic growth, democratization, and (in some cases) from war to peace; and how these changes require different property rights reform strategies and sequencing to foster further economic growth, sound resource use, and political stability. The lack of secure and negotiable property rights is one of the most critical limiting factors to achieving economic growth and democratic governance throughout the developing world. Insecure or weak property rights have negative impacts on:

- Economic investment and growth;
- Food security;
- Governance and the rule of law;
- Incidences of HIV/AIDS;
- Environment and sustainable resource use, including parks and park land, mineral resources, and forestry and water resources; and
- Biodiversity and sustainable resource exploitation.

At the same time, robust and secure rights (along with other economic factors) can promote economic growth; good governance; and sustainable use of land, forests, water, and other natural resources.

The United States Agency for International Development (USAID) is making a strategic commitment to developing a stronger, more robust policy for addressing property rights reform in countries where it operates. “Property rights” refers to the rights that individuals, communities, families, firms, and other corporate/community structures hold in land, pastures, water, forests, minerals, and fisheries. Property rights range from private or semi-private to leasehold, community, group, shareholder, or types of corporate rights. As land is a main factor for economic production in most countries where USAID has a presence, it is the main focus of this Property Rights and Resource Governance Task Order (TO) under the Prosperity, Livelihoods, and Conserving Ecosystems (PLACE) Indefinite Quantity Contract (IQC).

The Property Rights and Resource Governance Project (PRRGP) is a five-year initiative implemented by Tetra Tech ARD. The project was launched in September 2008, and is expected to be completed by September 11, 2012. The TO is managed by Tetra Tech ARD on behalf of USAID. It is a mechanism of the USAID/Economic Growth, Agriculture, and Trade Division/Natural Resources Management/Land Resources Management Team. Dr. Gregory Myers (gmyers@usaid.gov) is the TO’s operating Contracting Officer’s Technical Representative (COTR). PRRGP’s mission is to:

1. Expand analytical methodologies, tools, and training on property rights issues such as common property, governance, gender, conflict, and climate change;
2. Refine and scale up use of property rights tools in response to emerging issues and needs by USAID and its partners;
3. Refine knowledge management systems to integrate and spur two-way flows of information between training, tools, and policy interventions; and
4. Continue and expand technical assistance on property rights and resource governance to USAID missions and its partners.

One of the central objectives of the PRRGP TO is to build the capacity of U.S. Government (USG) staff and host country counterparts to address effectively property rights and resource governance issues in order to promote equitable economic growth, sustainable resource management, and poverty reduction. Training is a central component of the PRRGP strategy to attain that goal, with more than 20 percent of the TO's core budget dedicated to a Washington, D.C.-based training of USG staff (Task 1) and courses in the four USAID regions of support (Task 2).

I.0 INTRODUCTION

Under the Property Rights and Resource Governance Project (PRRGP) Task Order (TO), Tetra Tech ARD organized and conducted a three-day short course on “Property Rights and Resources Governance: Issues and Best Practices” at Tetra Tech ARD’s training facilities in Rosslyn, Virginia on October 20–22, 2010.

The course was intended for 35–40 USG foreign assistance practitioners interested in strengthening their understanding of Land Tenure and Property Rights (LTPR) and best practices internationally, and their application to United States Government (USG) programming. The short course was intended to provide the USG foreign assistance community in Washington, D.C. and on United States Agency for International Development (USAID) Missions with concepts, approaches, and tools for improving the programming of LTPR in USAID programs involving agricultural and economic growth, natural resources, health, and democracy and governance. This was the fifth LTPR course offered in Washington, D.C. by PRRGP and its predecessor task order.

The course had three main objectives:

1. Exchange experiences and strengthen understanding of LTPR issues, best practices, and their application to USG programming;
2. Introduce LTPR concepts, approaches, and tools aimed at improving programmatic interventions; and
3. Teach USG foreign assistance practitioners tools to address land tenure and property rights issues or use land tenure and property rights interventions to strengthen economic, food security, governance, and Natural Resource Management (NRM) objectives.

This course also included a cross-cutting focus on women’s rights and linkages between property rights and HIV infection.

Tetra Tech ARD organized the short course, including developing the agenda and announcement, organizing content, selecting presenters, coordinating participants, and implementing the short course and follow-up. Tetra Tech ARD, with assistance from the USAID Contracting Officer’s Technical Representative (COTR) for the PRRGP TO, took responsibility for announcing the short course; posting the short course on USAID’s internal Learning Management System; and circulating the course agenda and announcement among selected USAID bureaus, offices, and mission staff, as well as within the State Department, Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), Department of Defense, and the Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC). A total of 39 participants completed the short course.

The present document reports on this three-day course (see Appendices A and B for the training announcement and agenda, respectively) and provides: 1) an overview of the course and its structure, 2) a review of participant evaluations, and 3) recommendations and next steps. Feedback from the participants and other LTPR concepts, applications, and lessons learned from the field will inform the following USAID-sponsored LTPR training events.

Course materials and presentations are available at: <http://usaidlandtenure.net/ltpertools/training-documents>

2.0 COURSE OVERVIEW

Tetra Tech ARD utilized three primary methods for advertising the course:

- 1) Official USAID training notices were distributed worldwide through USAID's internal notification system;
- 2) An announcement for the course was circulated via e-mail by Tetra Tech ARD to its updated distribution list of USG contacts; and
- 3) The course was announced in conjunction with the offering of the Office of Conflict Management and Mitigation's Conflict 102 course.

Tetra Tech ARD conducted registration through USAID's internal Learning Management System (LMS). This system is free of charge, easily accessible by USAID staff, and those who utilize it receive credit on their USAID university transcripts. Tetra Tech ARD staff have been trained in this system and provided access to manage course participants through the LMS.

A total of 69 people registered; another 3 expressed interest but were unable to attend. By the time the course took place, 25 had canceled their registration and 5 remained on the waitlist. Of the 39 final participants (26 women and 13 men), 5 were from USAID Missions (Georgia, Haiti, Kenya, Peru, and Zimbabwe), 2 were from MCC (based in Burkina Faso), and 2 were from the CIA. The remaining 30 participants represented several USAID offices and Bureaus, such as Economic Growth, Agriculture and Trade (EGAT); Global Health; Democracy and Governance; Democracy, Conflict and Humanitarian Assistance (DCHA); and Bureau for Africa, among others. A total of 18 participants were part of the Development Leadership Initiative (DLI) class. In addition to the 39 participants, there was 1 observer from the Mercatus Center, George Mason University (see Appendix C for a list of participants).¹

The course agenda was developed based on lessons learned from the three courses offered between 2007 and 2009 in Washington, D.C., and on the participant feedback received from those courses. Building upon the success of the last course, a professional facilitator was again hired to facilitate the course. The organizers also took into consideration emerging themes in LTPR such as climate change, food security, HIV/AIDS, and land grabbing.

The October 2010 training course was composed of eight modules, several of which directly represent key areas of USAID programming. These modules are described in Table 2.1 on the following page.



¹ Please note that the list only includes 37 participants and the observer; the other 2 participants were from the CIA and did not wish to be included on the list.

2.1 MODULES

TABLE 2.1: MODULES AND THEMES PRESENTED

MODULE	THEME
Module 1	Introduction to Land Tenure and Property Rights (LTPR) Concepts
Module 2	Land Policy and Administration: A Tool for Managing Property Rights
Module 3	Secure Land Rights: A Critical Factor for Land Markets, Investment and Agricultural Growth
Module 4	Natural Resource Management: How Tenure Security Can Promote Conservation and Sustainable Use of Natural Resources
Module 5	Gender and Vulnerable Populations: Strengthening Access to Land and Resources
Module 6	Land and Natural Resource Conflict: How Rights and Access to Land and Resources Can be the Cause of Conflict and Can Fuel Conflict
Module 7	Competing Priorities for Land: Food Security, Climate Change and Commercial Pressures
Module 8	Wrapping It All Up

Each thematic module incorporated formal presentation(s) on various sub-themes of the module, usually in the form of PowerPoint presentations and discussion. Three modules included short films. In addition, participants applied knowledge and problem solving in group exercises surrounding four country case studies: Afghanistan, Colombia, Kenya, and Haiti.

2.2 TOOLS

As in previous short-courses, instructors employed a variety of learning tools to transfer knowledge and maintain a motivated training audience. Those tools are summarized in Table 2.2 below.

TABLE 2.2: TRAINING TOOLS

TRAINING TOOLS	PURPOSE
Presentations	PowerPoint presentation on specific LTPR issues and interventions incorporating examples from around the world
Facilitated Group Discussion	Facilitated plenary discussion
LTPR Framework and Matrix	Presentations describing LTPR tools—LTPR Framework, Matrix, and Assessment Tools.
Group Exercises	Broken out into four self-selected country case study working groups (Haiti, Colombia, Afghanistan, and Kenya), participants conducted a series of exercises. For each of four technical modules, working groups read two-page briefing materials on the actual country situation and then identified existing constraints and potential interventions to address those constraints. In a wrap-up exercise, each country group presented those constraints, interventions, and a roadmap of steps they would take as the USAID Mission addressing these LTPR issues.
Video Presentation	Videos were used to illustrate real world examples dealing with women's rights to land in Africa, ways in which USAID is addressing conflict diamonds in Sierra Leone, and impacts of land formalization and community organization in an urban neighborhood in the Philippines.

For this course, the instructors were all individuals who had participated in previous training courses: John Bruce, Mark Freudenberger, Peter Rabley, Renee Gioverelli, Amy Regas, and Mike Roth. Gary Forbes returned to facilitate the third consecutive Washington LTPR course.

2.3 COURSE MATERIALS

Handouts were minimized with good conservation practices in mind. At the end of the course, CD-ROMs were distributed. These included all course presentations and case exercises, dozens of technical briefs, reports, and reading lists (divided by subject matter) providing names of further studies and relevant documents. A list of relevant websites was also included.

2.4 COURSE CONTENT

Module 1 provided an introduction to LTPR concepts (*presented by John Bruce*):

The opening module introduced the four country case studies to participants through brief PowerPoints by the country resource experts. In addition, John Bruce provided an overview of LTPR terms, concepts, and definitions through an interactive presentation which was followed by an exercise where participants identified constraints in their own countries using the LTPR matrix to group those issues.

Quotes from 2010 course participants:

“The presentations were all excellent and full of valuable information”

“I loved the videos, case studies, and presentations”

“I can now make stronger arguments for coordinating with or including property rights components in my development-focused food security work”

Module 2 focused on land policy and administration as tools for managing property rights (*presented by Peter Rabley*):

Peter Rabley discussed the purpose and elements of sound land policy and legislation, as well as the pros and cons of customary and statutory land governance institutions. After a discussion period, Mr. Rabley then presented many of the common challenges being faced in land administration as along with available solutions, such as flexible cadastral systems, appropriate technology, modernization of public institutions, and increased public awareness, among others.

Module 3 discussed secure land rights as a critical factor for land markets, investment and agricultural growth (*presented by Mike Roth*):

Mr. Roth conveyed the linkages among land rights and tenure security, investment, and access to credit. He presented formal and informal mechanisms for securing tenure. The film *Hidden Paradise*, discussing the impacts of formalizing land rights in a poor urban Philippine neighborhood, was shown and discussed. These activities were followed by the first of four country case study working group sessions.

Module 4 focused on LTPR implications for NRM and biodiversity conservation (*presented by Mark Freudenberger*):

Utilizing visuals and a narrative that led participants on a virtual walk through the forests of Madagascar, Mark Freudenberger illustrated the important linkages between natural resource issues and land tenure. His presentation highlighted the long histories of contested struggles for access to land and other resources and also discussed how the USG often has competing objectives related to conservation, food security, and climate change. The second country working group session was held on NRM-related issues in each of the four countries under analysis.

Module 5 focused on LTPR in the context of gender and vulnerable populations (*presented by Renee Giovarelli*):

Renee Giovarelli provided an overview on issues of LTPR in the context of vulnerable populations. She defined vulnerability (in terms of resilience and ability to withstand disaster); the types of people who tend to be vulnerable to LTPR programs and policies (based on sex, age, ethnicity, etc.); and options for addressing issues of vulnerability in LTPR programs. The BBC video “Villages on the Front Line: Niger” was shown. This video illustrated the precarious tenure status of a group of village women in Niger. Ms. Giovarelli then made a presentation on constraints associated with protecting and strengthening land and property rights of

women. Her presentation focused on understanding the need to focus specifically on strengthening women's land tenure and property rights, how the HIV/AIDS epidemic affects women's rights to land, and the options that exist for strengthening women's rights to land and resources while still respecting local institutions and customs. The module wrapped up with the third country case study working session.

Module 6 focused on resource-based conflict over land and natural resources and post-conflict stabilization *(presented by John Bruce)*:

Mr. Bruce presented on issues and opportunities associated with tenure reform in post-conflict environments. Specifically, he discussed the linkages among land tenure and conflict, common post-conflict challenges; common LTPR interventions in post-conflict situations; challenges to restitution of property rights (of internally displaced persons [IDPs], refugees, returnees, and ex-combatants); and options for donor programming. Following Mr. Bruce's presentation, a 22-minute video was shown on how USAID is addressing conflict diamonds in Sierra Leone. Country work group sessions also took place.

Module 7 addressed competing priorities for land, including food security, climate change, and commercial pressures *(presented by Mike Roth)*:

This module conveyed the implications of the emerging phenomenon of competing priorities for land and linkages among LTPR, food security, conservation, energy, and development. Mr. Roth shared emerging ideas and approaches for how to address these competing land uses.

During the final afternoon of the course, country working groups prepared and presented on constraints identified in each country, proposed priority interventions, and a roadmap for how USAID might tackle the issues facing each case study nation.

The course ended with Gregory Myers handing out course completion certificates and CD-ROMs to each participant.

3.0 EVALUATION METHODS AND RESULTS

Participant evaluations were administered throughout the training. Participants were asked to complete evaluation forms for each module and then complete an overall evaluation of the whole course. The evaluation forms requested participants to rate their satisfaction with each presentation and module on a scale from 5 to 1, as follows: 5 (high), 4 (somewhat high), 3 (satisfactory), 2 (somewhat low), and 1 (low). The evaluation also asked participants to score each module on improved knowledge, improved understanding of interventions and best practices, and relevancy to work. The evaluation provided space for comments and suggestions for improvements to the course. Table 5.1 provides an average of all of the rankings received by each module of the training course. It must be noted that people have a tendency to avoid extremes in the ranking scale and particularly the high extremes (e.g., “5”s). The scores should be assessed from that perspective. On the final course evaluations, the average score for the course overall was 4.31.

TABLE 5.1: INDIVIDUAL MODULES SCORES FROM FINAL OVERALL EVALUATION

MODULE	RANKING
Module 1: Introduction to (LTPR) Concepts	4.07
Module 2: Land Policy and Administration	3.94
Module 3: Land Markets, Investment and Agricultural Growth	3.84
Module 4: Natural Resource Management	4.32
Module 5: Gender and Vulnerable Populations	3.71
Module 6: Land and Natural Resource Conflict	4.30
Module 7: Competing Priorities for Land	3.92
Overall course score given on the final evaluation form for the full course	4.31

Natural resource management (Module 4) was the highest-ranked module. With respect to individual pieces of the training program, the presentation on NRM was the highest-scored element. The videos on women’s land rights in Niger, formalization of land rights in the Philippines, and conflict diamonds were the next three highest-ranking elements of the course. Evaluation questions on improved understanding of interventions and best practices and relevancy to work consistently received the lowest scores within each module.

On the overall evaluation, a question on the content of the training program scored highly (4.27). Participants indicated that the format was appropriate (4.08) and rated the course a 4.15 on relevancy to their work (an improvement from the 3.96 in last year’s evaluation). Participants appeared to remain engaged throughout the

Additional quotes from course participants:

“This is the best AID course I have been to.”

“Don’t kill us with Power Points”

“Really informative and engaging”

“I like the opportunity to meet different people from different organizations because they share their experiences from desks/fields”

three-day course. There was very little absenteeism during the course, a major improvement over previous years. In general, participants noted the following as particular strengths of the course: the videos, case studies, presenters, and learning from each other.

APPENDIX A: COURSE ANNOUNCEMENT

USAID Short Course Announcement

Property Rights and Resource Governance Issues and Best Practices

Dates: October 20-22, 2010

Venue: 1611 N. Kent Street, Suite 700, Arlington, VA

USAID/Washington is pleased to announce the USAID Short Course on *Property Rights and Resource Governance Issues and Best Practices* scheduled for October 20-22, 2010. The course is intended for approximately 40 USG foreign assistance practitioners interested in strengthening their knowledge and skills in applying land tenure and property rights (LTPR) in their economic, food security, governance, climate change, and natural resource portfolios. The course has three objectives:

4. Exchange experiences and strengthen understanding of LTPR issues, best practices and their application to USG programming;
5. Introduce LTPR concepts and approaches at improving programmatic interventions;
6. Teach USG foreign assistance practitioners tools to address land tenure and property rights issues, or use land tenure and property rights interventions to strengthen economic, food security, governance and natural resource management objectives. This course also includes cross-cutting foci on the rights of women and other vulnerable populations.

This short course will provide the USG Foreign Assistance Community in Washington DC and posts with concepts, approaches and tools aimed at improving the programming of land tenure and property rights in donor programs involving natural resources, climate change, economic growth, food security and governance.

Through presentations, video, discussion and practical exercises based on country case studies, participants will share experience and strengthen their skills and expertise in the following:

Participant Comment on the LTPR Course

"I enjoyed the course more than any other training I've had in Washington thus far."

- LTPR concepts, current issues and interventions
- Land and resource tenure for women and other vulnerable groups
- Secure land rights as a critical factor for land markets, investment and agricultural growth
- LTPR in natural resource management, biodiversity conservation, and climate change
- Land and resource-based conflict and post-conflict stabilization
- Competing priorities for land (food security, climate change and commercial pressures)

This course is being offered in conjunction with the Office of Conflict Management and Mitigation's *Conflict 102* course, which will be offered on October 18-19, 2010 in the same location, so that interested participants have the opportunity for a full week of related training.

Please register through USAID's Learning Management System (LMS). Registration will close on October 13, 2010. For questions on how to use LMS or any other course queries, feel free to contact the course coordinators.

Timothy Fella
COTR PRRGP Task Order
tfella@usaid.gov

Roberto Prado
ARD Short Course Coordinator
rprado@ardinc.com

APPENDIX B: COURSE AGENDA

Property Rights and Resource Governance Issues and Best Practices

October 20-22, 2010

Venue: 1611 N. Kent Street, Suite 700, Arlington, VA

AGENDA

This short course will provide 40 USG foreign assistance practitioners training that strengthens their knowledge and skills in addressing land tenure and property rights (LTPR) challenges in their portfolios. The key objectives include:

1. Exchange experiences and strengthen understanding of LTPR issues, best practices internationally and their application to USAID programming;
2. Introduce LTPR concepts and approaches aimed at improving programmatic interventions in economic growth, food security, governance, natural resource management, conflict mitigation and climate change; and
3. Teach USG foreign assistance practitioners tools to address land tenure and property rights issues, or use land tenure and property rights interventions to strengthen economic development, governance, conflict mitigation and natural resource management objectives.

This course also includes cross-cutting foci on women's rights, and linkages between property rights and HIV infection.

DAY ONE

8:30 – 9:00 Welcome by Dr. Gregory Myers, USAID Senior Advisor, Land Tenure and Property Rights and Timothy Fella, USAID Land Tenure and Property Rights Conflict Specialist

9:00 – 9:40 Course overview, objectives, and participant introductions (Gary Forbes, facilitator)

Module 1: Introduction to land tenure and property rights (LTPR) concepts

Objectives: (1) Introduce and build interest in country cases; (2) Develop common understanding of terms and concepts; (3) Introduce LTPR tools that will be used throughout course.

9:40 – 9:50 Introduction to module and objectives (Gary Forbes)

9:50 – 10:20 Country case studies

- Afghanistan (Mike Roth)
- Colombia (Amy Regas)

10:20 – 10:30 Coffee break

10:30 – 11:00 Country case studies

- Kenya (John Bruce)
- Haiti (Mark Freudenberger)

11:00 – 11:30 Presentation on concepts and definitions (John Bruce)

11:30 – 11:45 Discussion on LTPR constraints in participant countries (John Bruce)

11:45 – 12:15 Introduction to LTPR tools (Mike Roth)

12:15 – 1:15 Lunch

Module 2 - Land policy and administration: A tool for managing property rights

Objectives: (1) Convey the process, purpose and elements of a sound land policy and legislation, and articulate the pros and cons of both customary and statutory land governance institutions; (2) Share programmatic interventions related to land policy and administration, and successful methods and technologies used in land administration.

1:15 – 1:25 Introduction to module and objectives (Gary Forbes)

1:25 – 1:55 Presentation on land policy and administration (Peter Rabley)

1:55 – 2:10 Discussion

2:10 – 2:30 Presentation on use of spatial data (Peter Rabley)

Module 3 – Secure land rights: A critical factor for land markets, investment and agricultural growth

Objectives: (1) Convey linkages between land rights and tenure security, investment, access to credit, etc., and present formal and informal mechanisms for securing tenure; (2) Share programmatic interventions for securing land rights.

2:30 – 2:40 Introduction to module and objectives (Gary Forbes)

2:40 – 3:05 Presentation on security of land tenure (Mike Roth)

3:05 – 3:20 Coffee break

3:20 – 3:45 Video: Hidden paradise water resources and transformation of a slum in the Philippines

3:45 – 4:00 Discussion

4:00 – 5:15 Explanation of country case study group exercises, division into country groups, and first country case group working session to identify LTPR constraints that impede security of tenure and determine potential interventions.

5:15 – 5:30 End day wrap-up

DAY TWO

8:30 – 8:40 LTPR film clips

Module 4 – Natural resource management: How tenure security can promote conservation and the sustainable use of natural resources

Objectives: (1) Convey why property rights over natural resources are important to biodiversity conservation, good governance, economic growth, and adaptation and mitigation of climate change; (2) Share tenure related programmatic interventions to promote sustainable resource uses.

8:40 – 8:50 Introduction to module and objectives (Gary Forbes)

8:50 – 9:30 Presentation of LTPR Issues in NRM, biodiversity conservation, and GCC (Mark Freudenberger)

9:30 – 9:45 Coffee break

9:45 – 10:30 Discussion

10:30 – 11:30 Second country case study group working session to identify constraints to sustainable use of natural resources

11:30 – 1:00 Lunch (off premises)

Module 5: Gender and vulnerable populations: Strengthening access to land and resources

Objectives: (1) Convey the meaning of vulnerability in the context of LTPR, why women's land rights matter, and the linkages between LTPR and HIV/AIDS; (2) Share the various policy, administrative, judicial, institutional and programmatic options for strengthening women's and other vulnerable groups' rights to land and resources.

1:00 – 1:10 Introduction to module and objectives (Gary Forbes)

1:10 – 1:30 Presentation on understanding the vulnerability and property rights (Renee Giovarelli)

1:30 – 1:50 Video Villages on Front Lines: Niger

1:50 – 2:05 Discussion

2:05 – 2:25 Presentation on protecting property rights of women (Renee Giovarelli)

2:25 – 2:40 Discussion

2:40 – 2:55 Coffee break

2:55 – 3:55 Third country case study group working session to identify constraints to women's and vulnerable groups' access to land and resources, and potential interventions.

3:55-4:15 End day wrap-up

DAY THREE

8:30 – 8:40 LTPR film clips

Module 6 – Land and natural resource conflict: How rights and access to land and resources can be the cause of conflict and can fuel conflict

Objectives: (1) Convey what we mean by resource-based conflict and how resources either prompt or become the focus of conflict; (2) Share programmatic options for managing conflicts over resources and for resettling IDPS in a post-conflict environment.

8:40-8:50 Introduction to module and objectives (Gary Forbes)

8:50-9:20 Presentation on land, natural resources and violent conflict (John Bruce)

9:20-9:45 Video: PRADD Conflict Diamonds

9:45-10:00 Coffee break

10:00-10:45 Discussion

10:40-11:45 Fourth country case study group working session to identify LTPR constraints that might cause conflict and potential interventions.

11:45 – 12:45 Lunch

Module 7 - Competing priorities for land: Food security, climate change and commercial pressures

Objectives: (1) Convey implications of the emerging phenomenon of competing priorities for land and linkages between LTPR, food security, conservation, energy and development; (2) Share emerging ideas and approaches for how to address these competing land uses.

12:45-12:55 Introduction to module and objectives (Gary Forbes)

12:55-1:20 Presentation on competing priorities for land (Mike Roth)

1:20 – 1:45 Discussion

Module 8 - Wrapping It All Up

Objective: Allow participants to present their case study conclusions and ask any remaining questions to the expert trainers.

1:45-1:55 Introduction to module and objectives (Gary Forbes)

1:55-3:00 Final country case study group working session to develop country roadmap of actions and prepare for presentations. Participants will develop a roadmap of steps they would take as the USAID/Country Mission to address LTPR issues.

3:00-4:00 15-minute presentations by each country group on their roadmap, country constraints and priority interventions.



4:00-4:30 Discussion

4:30-5:00 Evaluations, diplomas, closing

APPENDIX C: LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Short course on Property Rights and Resource Governance Issues and Best Practices
October 20-22, 2010

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Name	Title/organization	Email address
1. Alefia Merchant	Agriculture Development Officer USAID/ EGAT	amerchant@usaid.gov
2. Alexis Jones	Agriculture Development Officer USAID/ EGAT/AG	aljones@usaid.gov
3. Andrew Nelson	Economist USAID/EGAT	anelson@usaid.gov
4. Beatrice Wamalwa	Program Management Specialist Agriculture Business and Environment Office USAID/Kenya	bwamalwa@usaid.gov
5. Brandon Fenley	Economist USAID/EGAT	bfenley@usaid.gov
6. Bruce Abrams	Office Director Office of Democracy and Governance USAID/Peru	babrams@usaid.gov
7. Chelsea Jaccard	Foreign Service Officer USAID	cjaccard@usaid.gov
8. Christopher Burns	Economic Growth and Agricultural Development Advisor USAID/ EGAT/WID	chburns@usaid.gov

Name	Title/organization	Email address
9. Dara Katz	Democracy Specialist USAID/DCHA/OCR	dkatz@usaid.gov
10. Edward Lawrence	DG Officer USAID/ DCHA/DG	elawrence@usaid.gov
11. Elena Facchini	FSO-DLI USAID/ Global Health	efacchini@usaid.gov
12. Erin Ricci	Program/Project Development Officer USAID	er Ricci@usaid.gov
13. James LaFleur	Senior Economic Advisor Economic Growth Office USAID/Zimbabwe	jla fleur@usaid.gov
14. Jennifer Connolly	Crisis, Stabilization, and Governance officer USAID/DCHA	jconnolly@usaid.gov
15. Jenny Murphy	Senior Rule of Law Advisor USAID/ DCHA/DG/ROL	jemurphy@usaid.gov
16. Jeremy Meadows	Democracy and Governance Officer USAID/AFR/SD/CPG	jmeadows@usaid.gov
17. John Brighenti	Foreign Service Agricultural Officer USAID/ EGAT/AG	jbrighenti@usaid.gov
18. Karol Boudreaux (OBSERVER)	Senior Research Fellow/Instructor Mercatus Center George Mason University	kboudrea@gmu.edu
19. Katelin Maher	Program Manager/Foreign Service Officer USAID/DCHA/OTI	kmaher@usaid.gov

Name	Title/organization	Email address
20. Kristin Poore	Crisis, Stabilization and Governance Officer USAID/ DCHA/FFP	kpoore@usaid.gov
21. Leanne Webster	Foreign Service Officer USAID/DCHA/Rule of Law	lwebster@usaid.gov
22. Lena Zezulín	Supervisory Attorney-Advisor Office of the General Counsel USAID	lzezulin@usaid.gov
23. Lesley Stone	Health Policy and Legislative Analyst USAID/ GH/SPBO	lstone@usaid.gov
24. Mariam Ubilava	Project Management Specialist and Mission Environmental Officer USAID/ Georgia	mubilava@usaid.gov
25. Mary Ackley	Natural Resource Manager USAID/EGAT	mackley@usaid.gov
26. Megan Kyles	FSO EGAT/AG/USAID	mkyles@usaid.gov
27. Mikell O'Mealy	Foreign Service Environment Officer USAID/EGAT	mo'mealy@usaid.gov
28. Molly Glenn	Deputy Resident Country Director Millennium Challenge Corporation - Burkina Faso	glennma@mcc.gov
29. Nelson Diarte	Foreign Service Officer USAID/EGAT/AG	ndiarte@usaid.gov
30. Rachel Sorey	Crisis, Stabilization and Governance Officer USAID/ DCHA/DG	rsorey@usaid.gov
31. Sarah Crites	Country Desk Officer USAID/Bureau for Africa	scrites@usaid.gov

Name	Title/organization	Email address
32. Serge P. Barbare	Senior Development Specialist. Millennium Challenge Corporation - Burkina Faso	barbaresp@mcc.gov
33. Shannon Rogers	Program Manager Stability and Economic Growth USAID/Haiti	srogers@usaid.gov
34. Suzanne Truchard	Foreign Service Officer USAID/DCHA	struchard@usaid.gov
35. Travis Guymon	Foreign Service Officer USAID/EGAT/AG	tguymon@usaid.gov
36. Veronika Martin	Program Officer USAID/OFDA	vmartin@usaid.gov
37. Victoria Donovan	Democracy Specialist Office of Democracy and Governance USAID	vdonovan@usaid.gov
38. Whitney Dubinsky	Foreign Service Officer USAID/EGAT/EG	wdubinsky@usaid.gov

APPENDIX D: PRESENTER BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCHES



ABOUT THE INSTRUCTORS

JOHN BRUCE

Dr. John W. Bruce, SJD, has worked on land policy and law in developing countries for 40 years, primarily in Africa and East Asia. He began work on land tenure in the late 1960s as a Peace Corps legal advisor to the Ministry of Land Reform in Ethiopia, and later did research for his legal doctorate on customary land tenure in Ethiopia's Tigray region. He spent five years in Sudan as the Ford Foundation's representative in the 1970s, teaching Property at the Faculty of Law of the University of Khartoum and coordinating the Faculty's Sudan Customary Law Research Project. He returned to the University of Wisconsin-Madison in 1980, serving as the African Program coordinator and then director of the Land Tenure Center, an interdisciplinary research center working on land tenure issues in developing countries. In 1996, Dr. Bruce left the University to join the legal department of the World Bank, where he served as senior counsel (Land Law) and as the land tenure expert for the Bank's Rural Development Department. Dr. Bruce retired from the World Bank in 2006 and now heads a small consulting firm, Land and Development Solutions International. He has published extensively on land policy and law, most recently *Land Law Reform: Achieving Development Policy Objectives* (World Bank, 2006), *Land and Business Formalization for Legal Empowerment of the Poor, Strategic Overview Paper* (ARD for USAID, 2007), and with Anna Knox, *Structures and Stratagems: Decentralization of Authority over Land in Africa*, World Development 37(8): 1360-1369 (2009). Dr. Bruce holds his J.D. from Columbia University and his S.J.D. from the University of Wisconsin-Madison.

TIM FELLA

Mr. Tim Fella is the land tenure and conflict specialist with USAID in Washington, D.C. He provides technical assistance on tenure and property rights challenges as they relate to conflict over natural assets, governance and humanitarian crises. He has worked on the design and implementation of land tenure and property rights programs for more than five years in a variety of countries including Lesotho, Burkina Faso, Sudan, Liberia, Sri Lanka, Haiti and Jamaica. Prior to joining USAID in January 2010, Mr. Fella worked with the Property Rights and Land Policy team at the Millennium Challenge Corporation where he participated in the development and implementation of comprehensive land administration reform projects in Lesotho, Burkina Faso, and Liberia totaling over \$88 million. He has a Master's degree in Social Sciences for International Development from the University of Aalborg, Denmark, and has conducted research into the formalization of informal settlements in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia and communal land tenure insecurity in Sri Lanka.

GARY FORBES

Mr. Gary Forbes is a facilitator and organizational consultant with more than 25 years of experience. As a specialist in participatory methods, Mr. Forbes has provided conference and workshop facilitation for ARD projects during the last 15 years, and has helped bring together stakeholder groups and create networks among local governments, NGOs and community leaders. He is a founding member and past president of the International Association of Facilitators (IAF), and has provided training in Advanced Participation Methods (APM) in over twenty countries. These methods are highly successful in developing active participation when applied to strategic and multi-sectoral planning, organizational development interventions, and development of shared-responsibility teams. Mr. Forbes has also facilitated workshops and conferences, and conducted training sessions for a number of organizations and agencies, such as Mercy Corp and USAID. He holds a Masters' degree in international management from the American Graduate School of International Management, and a Bachelor's degree in history from Macalester College.

MARK FREUDENBERGER

Mr. Mark S. Freudenberger is the chief of party for USAID's Property Rights and Resource Governance task order implemented by ARD Inc. He brings to this position over 30 years of field experience in natural resource management in Sahelian West Africa and Madagascar. Tenure and resource management issues have long been the focus of his work in Africa. Freudenberger just returned to the States after 11 years of managing USAID eco-regional



conservation and development programs in Madagascar. Previous to this position, he was a senior social scientist for the World Wildlife Fund in Washington, D.C. where he lead a population-environment program but also launched the first field studies on the social and ecological impacts of diamond mining in national parks of the Central African Republic. During five years at the Land Tenure Center of the University of Wisconsin, he pioneered the use of RRA/PRA tools to analyze the evolution of tenure institutions in Senegal, The Gambia, and Guinea. He was a Peace Corps volunteer in Togo. After these first two formative years, he implemented agricultural education programs for Catholic Relief Services in south central Burkina Faso. Mr. Freudenberger grew up as a child in the southern Katanga of the Democratic Republic of Congo. He holds a PhD in regional planning and natural resource management from UCLA. His wife and two young daughters presently live in Madagascar where all are deeply engaged in community mobilization and education.

RENEE GIOVARELLI

Ms. Renée Giovarelli is the Director of the Global Center for Women's Land Rights, an initiative of the Rural Development Institute (RDI). Renée pioneered RDI's Women and Land Program, and has more than 15 years of legal experience in the areas of land tenure and property rights. Her areas of specialization include intra-household and gender issues and customary land law. Renée has designed and conducted fieldwork on women and their access and rights to land in the Kyrgyz Republic, Uzbekistan, Tajikistan, Azerbaijan, Bulgaria, Russia, India, China, Uganda, Ghana, Madagascar, Burkina Faso, and Ethiopia. She was the team leader for a year-long study evaluating the impact of World Bank land projects on women in four key geographic regions (represented by Bolivia, Azerbaijan, Laos, and Ghana). Renée has also designed interventions to ensure that women are included in the governance and implementation of LTPR projects for USAID, MCC, and the World Bank. She has a B.A. in English (with high distinction) from the University of Arizona, a J.D. (cum laude) from Seattle University, where she was an adjunct professor, a master of law degree (LL.M.) in International Sustainable Development from the University of Washington School of Law, and an MFA in Writing from the Vermont College of Fine Arts.

GREGORY MYERS

Dr. Gregory Myers is the senior land tenure and property rights specialist with USAID in Washington, D.C., and he manages the agency's Land Tenure Unit, which focuses on tenure challenges as they relate to economic growth, food security, climate change, conflict, natural-resource management and the spread of infectious disease. He has worked on and published articles related to LTPR and conflict issues for more than 20 years. He has worked in a number of conflict and post-conflict countries, including Mozambique, Angola, Rwanda, Burundi, Uganda, Ethiopia, Liberia, East Timor, Afghanistan, Sudan, Sri Lanka, DRC, Haiti and Kosovo. Some of his most recent work has focused on resource rights and conflict diamonds in West Africa, including the Central African Republic and Guinea. In addition, Dr. Myers has worked on privatization and property rights issues in Eastern Europe and Central Asia. He is the COTR for USAID's Property Rights and Resource Governance Task Order, a \$50 million dollar program designed to address LTPR and resource governance issues, conduct research on best practices and provide technical assistance to missions, operating units and USG agencies. The task order currently provides technical assistance to approximately 20 USAID missions, three USAID regional bureaus, and the Department of State. This course and the tools presented in this course have been developed through the LTPR program that Dr. Myers manages.

PETER RABLEY

Mr. Peter Rabley started ILS in September 1996 to focus on delivering high quality, low-cost, replicable solutions for land administration worldwide. He is an information technology and geographic and land information systems (GIS/LIS) senior systems analyst with more than 25 years of experience in Central and Eastern Europe, the Former Soviet Union, Latin America and the Caribbean, South and Southeast Asia, Western Europe, the United Kingdom, and the United States. Mr. Rabley has designed, developed and implemented information technology applications with a particular focus on land registries and cadastral applications in a variety of working and data conditions, including in developing and transitional economies. These include land cadastre and real estate information systems, land recording, titling and



registry systems, and land use inventORIZATION. His technical background includes comprehensive experience with systems design, process engineering, software engineering, and project management as well as a variety of major software packages (multi-platform), operating systems, and programming languages. Mr. Rabley attended Queens College, Nassau, Bahamas, and Douai School, Newbury, UK and received his degrees in geography and economics from the Universities of Michigan and Miami.

AMY REGAS

Ms. Amy Regas is a senior associate for ARD's Land Tenure and Property Rights Sector and the training task team leader for the Property Rights and Resource Governance Task Order. She possesses 18 years of experience in implementing multi-disciplinary activities funded by USAID, the World Bank, MCC and other donors. Prior to joining ARD, Ms. Regas was a land specialist for the Millennium Challenge Corporation and a director for Chemonics International's Latin America and Caribbean Division. She recently conducted an analysis of property rights constraints in Colombia, participated in the design of Burkina Faso's MCC land project, evaluated pilot property regularization project in Nicaragua and Colombia, and analyzed the impact of a USAID-funded activity in Ecuador aimed at strengthening territorial rights of indigenous peoples. Between 2004 and 2007, Ms. Regas coordinated the Inter-American Alliance for Real Property Rights, a network of advocates promoting the advancement of property rights systems in the Western Hemisphere. She holds a Masters' degree in international affairs with an emphasis in economic development from George Washington University.

MICHAEL ROTH

Dr. Michael Roth co-heads the USAID Lessons Learned: Property Rights and Natural-Resource Management Task Order within ARD, Inc. where he is responsible for training and tools development. He is a senior associate and head of ARD, Inc.'s Program on Land Tenure and Property Rights. He also serves as the senior technical advisor/manager for the USAID/Ethiopia's Strengthening Land Tenure and Administration Program and senior technical advisor on the USAID/Sudan Customary Land Tenure Program. Dr. Roth was formerly senior social scientist at the University of Wisconsin-Madison's Land Tenure Center, where he conducted research and training on linkages between customary tenure, formalization and agricultural performance; land market development; peri-urban market development; and equity sharing models for agricultural development spanning work in the Gambia, Ghana, Mozambique, Somalia, Uganda and South Africa. In the context of Eastern and Southern Africa, he has conducted land sub sector assessments in Zambia, Zimbabwe, and South Africa, and land tenure and property rights assessments in Ethiopia and Mozambique. Dr. Roth was formally program director of the Broadening Access and Strengthening Input Market Systems (BASIS) Collaborative Research Support Program (CRSP), and served as the University's principle land economist and researcher on its Zimbabwe Land Reform and Resettlement Project.

APPENDIX E: SUMMARY OF PARTICIPANT EVALUATIONS

MODULE 1: CONCEPTS				
Question	Total Points Received	Number of Respondents	Average score	Comments
1: Country cases	156	36	4.33	Too quickly, but generally good. Great overview! Amy and Mark are excellent presenters, energized, concise, and organized presentations. Gregory's intro was also excellent. Haiti presentation was very engaging. Really enjoyed the country cases, especially Haiti. Very interesting. Each case was different so cases were not "comparable." A lot of info presented too quickly.
2: Concepts and definitions	157	36	4.36	Good base. If time allotted, could have been more participatory or example based. Could have been more energized and concise. John Bruce was excellent.
3: Discussion on LTPR constraints in participant countries	129	33	3.91	Would have benefited with some more examples, and real-life appreciations (went too quickly). Good. Great to learn from peers' experiences.
4: Introduction to LTPR tools	136	36	3.78	Again, this is a complex too, so to do this quickly is difficult.
5: Improved knowledge and understanding of LTPR terms and concepts	147	35	4.20	
6: Improved your understanding of common LTPR constraints faced in developing nations	136	34	4.00	
7: Relevancy to your work	136	35	3.89	
			4.07	Overall: It is really hard to see the slides from the back. General lack of energy. Too much information. Need to give more thought into what is most relevant.

MODULE 2: LAND ADMIN				
Question	Total Points Received	Number of Respondents	Average score	Comments
1: Presentation on land policy and administration	132	33	4.00	More time for examples. Good presenter! Very Thoughtful. Presentation was engaging.
2: Discussion	105	27	3.89	No real discussion occurred. Lack of real-life examples to react to or discuss.
3: Presentation on the use of spatial data	138	33	4.18	Excellent presentation. Very interesting!
4: Helped you understand the process, purpose and elements of a sound land policy and legislation	125	32	3.91	
5: Helped you understand the pros and cons of both customary and statutory land governance institutions	127.5	32	3.98	
6: Improved your understanding of LTPR programmatic interventions for land policy and administration	119	32	3.72	Need more USAID examples
7: Improved your understanding of successful methods and technologies used in land administration	122	32	3.81	
8: Relevancy to your work?	125	31	4.03	
			3.94	(From 4 to 8): Overall this was quite frustrating. Much of it felt duplicative of the content covered in Module 1. It would have been helpful to spend less time on the general theory/concepts and instead present real-life issues, interventions and solutions. Examples of what USAID and others are actually doing. Overall: Excellent day. Well laid out.

MODULE 3: LAND MARKETS, INVESTMENT AND AG GROWTH				
Question	Total Points Received	Number of Respondents	Average score	Comments
1: Presentation on security of land tenure	109	30	3.63	Too many generalities and a lot of stuff did not seem very important. Very low-energy presenter. The way the content was presented was very dry. Would have been nice to see a real example on the ground and would have been helpful to see an example reflecting USAID interventions. Michael seems like he is condescending with the participants and did not do a good job facilitating the discussion. Presentation was not well framed. Disjointed from the rest of the day.
2: Video: Hidden Paradise Water...	132	30	4.40	
3: Discussion	113	30	3.77	Good discussion. Moderator suggested local government engagement
4: Helped you understand the linkages between land rights and tenure security, investments, and access to credit	112	29	3.86	Did not capture broader sense of issues.
5: Improved your knowledge of formal and informal mechanisms for securing land tenure	107	29	3.69	
6: Improved your understanding of LTPR interventions and best practices for securing land rights	105	29	3.62	
7: Relevancy to your work?	118	30	3.93	
			3.84	Overall, I think I am having trouble relating the learning goals to authentic tasks I might encounter at any post. Most posts don't have the funds to run a stand-alone program without it being a serious focus of the host government. I am also having trouble with the focus on the interventions. We generally focus on the development challenges and then look at what needs to be done to meet that challenge. Overall: Would like to see more examples of actual USAID programming. General: PowerPoints often had too much and therefore too small. There were flow problems, printed handouts often exaggerated "hard to read problem".

MODULE 4: NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT				
Question	Total Points Received	Number of Respondents	Average score	Comments
1: LTPR issues in NRM, biodiversity conservation, and GCC	134	29	4.62	Good presenter! Great, great, great real-life explanation. Thank you for this. Excellent presentation! Best presentation so far. Very practical, comprehensive. Very appropriate and interesting way of engaging w/the material and in a cultural context. Excellent presentation! The detailed presentation on Madagascar was rich, and extremely effective. Well done! Reflections on good (national) governance as an enabler of sustainable NRM were interesting. Very good presentation, very inclusive but not overwhelming. Very interesting, detailed and real world. A little long to get the point across. Mark gave an excellent presentation, illustrating in a visual and creating way the complexities and the context surrounding LTPR issues in Madagascar. Presentation was both concise and dense with questions that fed robust discussion afterwards. Excellent! Also, nice that Mark clarified and described USAID's and others' roles throughout.
2: Discussion	121	29	4.17	The topic covered a broad spectrum of LTPR that sparked good discussions
3: Improved knowledge and understanding of why property rights over natural resources are important to biodiversity conservation, good governance, economic growth, and adaptation to and mitigation of climate change	125	29	4.31	The assignment isn't entirely clear. Stronger understanding but still not clear on possible interventions or tools to apply.
4: Improved understanding of LTPR programmatic interventions related to conservation and sustainable NRM	122	29	4.21	Great film clips!
5: Relevancy to your work?	124	29	4.28	
			4.32	

MODULE 5: GENDER AND VP				
Question	Total Points Received	Number of Respondents	Average score	Comments
1: Understanding Vulnerability and Property Rights	123	33	3.73	Needed more examples integrated throughout the presentation. Renee gave an excellent summary of the issues, with the right level of detail to stimulate a great discussion and questions.
2: Video: Villages on the Front Line: Niger	143	33	4.33	The video was really helpful to see women working on these issues in a real-life case.
3: Discussion	124	33	3.76	
4: Protecting Property Right of Women	117	32	3.66	Need to ground more in one or two concrete examples, gave too many. Way too long. Could have used more examples.
5: Improved knowledge and understanding of vulnerability in the context of land tenure and property rights?	119	33	3.61	
6: Helped you understand why women's land rights matter, and the linkages between LTPR and HIV/AIDS	117	33	3.55	
7: Improved your knowledge of policy, administrative, judicial, institutional and programmatic options for strengthening women's and other vulnerable groups' rights to land and resources	97	29	3.34	
8: Relevancy to your work?	100	27	3.70	
			3.71	Good session but still feel lacking in knowing "tools" and techniques to use. Too many evaluations!

MODULE 6: LAND AND NATURAL RESOURCE CONFLICT				
Question	TOTAL	Number of Respondents	Average score	Comments
1: Presentation on Land, Natural Resources and Violent Conflict	138	33	4.18	100 Africa focused. Should have had more examples from other resources. I very much appreciate the case study examples presented. Not good to read the PowerPoint slides to the audience—the key messages were actually confused—a better approach is to talk naturally about the issues and let PowerPoint slides accentuate key points. Very good presentation and good ideas about intervention
2: Video: PRADD Conflict Diamonds	161.5	35	4.61	Great video! Very helpful to see a successful set of interventions. Interesting and comprehensive video (2) Excellent way to introduce a topic
3: Discussion	144	34	4.24	Mark did a great job facilitating a rich discussion.
4: Improved your understanding of resource-based conflict and how resources either prompt or become the focus of conflict	148	35	4.23	
5: Improved your knowledge about programmatic options for managing conflicts over resources and for resettling IDPS in a post-conflict environment	147	35	4.20	Didn't really address IDP/refugee resettlement - would like to see more discussion of IDP settlement issues
6: Relevancy to your work?	152	35	4.34	

MODULE 6: LAND AND NATURAL RESOURCE CONFLICT				
Question	TOTAL	Number of Respondents	Average score	Comments
			4.30	Recommendation for updates to training: USAID is now focused on outcome based contracting. USAID officers designing projects are urged to focus ONLY on the goals and outcomes they would like to see that will address the key developmental challenge NOT the specific activities/interventions (the “how”) that will lead to these outcomes. ‘The “how” is the responsibility of contractors/grantees to propose. I have been frustrated by this case study because it seems to be reinforcing what we’re specifically taught NOT to do - reidentify all the problems we see and design activities to ‘solve’ the problems - rather than starting with the desired end-state objectives. Suggestions for improving Day 1 of this course: Ask all participants to read the USAID LTPR overview brochure before coming to day 1, so that they’ll be familiar with the general theories and concepts. Then spend Day 1 illustrating the concepts in the context of on-the-ground examples - integrating photos and visuals into the PowerPoint presentations so the concepts and theories are brought to life. Engage participants throughout each presentation, by seeking participants’ ideas about what the concepts mean, and ask them to share their experiences working on these issues. Also, during Day 2 or 3, give participants an opportunity to self select into 5 regional groups corresponding to USAID regions, where they can have facilitated discussion and sharing of LTPR issues/opportunities in their countries (where they work or where they’re headed) or regions. (overall) the best one yet!

MODULE 7: COMPETING PRIORITIES				
Question	Total Points Received	Number of Respondents	Average score	Comments
1: Presentation on competing priorities for land	140	34	4.12	Good—depressing and frustrating news—but important. The presentation was very one sided and didn't question the premise of development. Very good and realistic. Quite thought provoking. I recommend this to be used in all future courses. Thought was quite eye opening. Very thought provoking and eye opening. Very good, hit the key points. Very interesting. Thought it could benefit from more nuanced views. Interesting in a way but somewhat diffuse and confusing. Maybe you could link in case studies, not sure but look at revamping. It's worth looking at the competing issues but maybe in a different way.
2: Discussion	133	34	3.91	Contentious!
3: Improved your knowledge about the implications of the emerging phenomenon of competing priorities for land	128	32	4.00	I would suggest that after discussions presenters should highlight possible solutions/interventions.
4: Improved your understanding of linkages between LTPR, food Security, conservation, energy and development	128	33	3.88	A lot of issues here, the module touched on them but did not explore enough. I think it could be strengthened with more examples.
5: Improved your knowledge about approaches for how to address these competing land issues	119	33	3.61	The interventions were a bit lacking, but maybe that is the point. More vivid examples/options would be helpful. Think could be teased out more. Limited on this.
6: Relevancy to your work?	132	33	4.00	I'm most curious about what opening will exist within the new F & F structure for combining some over traditional ag, FFP and nutrition programming with governance components such as property rights. Extremely relevant! No work, just training. The discussions were a bit long (45 min?) and were mostly the presenters/facilitators continuing to lecture.
			3.92	

Question	TOTAL	Number of Respondents	OVERALL CONTENT	
			Average score	Comments
1: Introduction to Land Tenure and Property Rights (LTPR) Concepts	135.5	33	4.11	Add involuntary settlements to concepts. Wondered why the concept of 'housing, land & property' HLP rights was not highlighted/covered - distinction between comm, agr, residential different nature. A little too much info at end, all useful but slightly overloaded. Amy and Mark presented great case studies. Presentation on concepts & definitions was too dry for such a rich & important topic. Needs to come alive with examples & visuals. Good way to start. Excellent - at times, seemed a bit too theoretical without enough examples - but I came to see the need for this foundation. Good overview. Too much focus on why LTPR is important, too def. focused without relevant context, too much reading of ppt (but MAYBE NECESSARY). A more participatory or illustrative introduction might have been helpful. Well done. Felt this was weak, too much provided and not enough thought on how to prioritize.
2: Land Policy and Administration: A Tool for Managing Property Rights	134.5	33	4.08	Great explanation of data in particular. Could be simplified, a little too technical. Tools? Tools, could be unpacked more - how do you use the tools? Would have liked to hear discussion on the linkage of urban planning with social policy & governance/rol issues. Also, how other sectors & branches - police, judiciary - are related. What about regulations? Enforcement issues also not fully discussed. Spatial data presentation was not adequately relevant to LTPR issues - could have been a shorter segment or handout. Presentation on policy admin would have been improved by teaching through examples & visuals rather than PowerPoint.
3: Secure Land Rights: A Critical Factor for Land Markets, Investment and Agricultural Growth	132.5	33	4.02	Good, but needed more practical examples of applications. Well done. Alternative tenure arrangements could be discussed more. Also, secure land rights is critical for functioning of gov't/ability to deliver services. I thought there would be more technical info on laws, titling, etc. or on alternatives, such as land claims registry. Should be more technical. Examples and visuals needed, the video was a welcome departure from dry PowerPoint presentations of basic information. This presentation topic may have been better in secure land rights had been treated separately first before linking it to land markets, etc.
4: Natural Resource Management: How Tenure Security Can Promote Conservation and Sustainable Use of Natural Resources	146.5	33	4.44	Excellent presentation approach- very tangible. Well presented. It was easy to understand. Great format, very engaging. Mark's presentation was excellent! Very interesting. Best presentation of the 3 days.

Question	TOTAL	Number of Respondents	OVERALL CONTENT	
			Average score	Comments
5: Gender and Vulnerable Populations: Strengthening Access to Land and Resources	130	33	3.94	Perhaps the weakest, only because it lacked examples more than any other module. Would have liked a bit more in-depth analysis/discussion on this. In general, I felt that this component presented the most new information to me. For example, I didn't realize that land ownership decreased women's vulnerability and this influences HIV rates among women. Very well done. Discussions were good. Really feel like these should be 2 separate modules, especially because "vulnerable populations" covers so many categories with different programming needs - indigenous, displaced, etc. Renee did a great job of describing real-life LTPR examples & issues. Okay but not particularly compelling.
6: Land and Natural Resource Conflict: How Rights and Access to Land and Resources Can be the Cause of Conflict and Can Fuel Conflict	132	32	4.13	This seemed really obvious. I'd like it to address more solutions. Excellent, I loved the videos - increased understanding. The best. Nice presentation! Poor presentation on conflict - read from PowerPoint slides. Blood Diamond video was great!! Need some non-Africa examples
7: Competing Priorities for Land: Food Security, Climate Change and Commercial Pressures	124	31	4.00	Would have liked an opposing view as well during the discussion period, not just proponents. Excellent, thought provoking. What about economic growth as the goal? Too confusing, never really came together
8: Wrapping It All Up	101	26	3.88	Very well done. Not enough give and take time. Very very good
9: Objectives were stated clearly	145	32	4.53	
10: Content of the training program	136.5	32	4.27	Excellent combination of topics. I would like to see a little more technical, in-depth info
11: Relevancy of program content to your work	124.5	30	4.15	? I am forever in training. Not enough practical application & programming training
12: Format for presentations and discussions was appropriate to the material	130.5	32	4.08	I loved the videos, case studies, and presentations. Too many PowerPoints with straight forward content - more photos/different format would help keep people engaged. Thought could be sharper/more structured presentations that provided a framework & how ease study illustrated. Like the post-cheat sheet, format is good but I feel more time & smaller examples are needed in order to absorb basic building block. Felt too much was being covered & ranged over too many examples to give enough depth

Question	TOTAL	Number of Respondents	OVERALL CONTENT	
			Average score	Comments
I3: Country case study working groups effectively allowed you to apply the information you learned to USAID programming scenarios	122	32	3.81	This is a great way to structure case study/group work. Overall, I found this process to not at all match the program design scenarios I've encountered in the field. Many design teams I've encountered have actually been chastised by contracting officers for approaching design from an activity-first manner. Very well written in a simple way, easy to understand. Thanks for breaking down the case study down into pieces. We should've had more time to discuss country case studies. It felt superficial at times. Interesting but needed more focus & parameters throughout. Complexity of issues led to very mood conversations. Great case studies, provided just enough background to elicit creative discussion. Was useful in some ways but ran out of steam, too much direction from resource person. I felt there was too much time spent on programming scenarios without enough technical knowledge to apply.
I4: Overall, how would you rate your training program experience?	125	29	4.31	Very good course!
			4.12	

What were the highlights for you from the three-day short course on LTPR—Issues and Best Practices?

Comments:

- Videos were great, enjoyed the country think tank.
- I like the opportunity to meet different people from different organizations because they share their experiences from desk/fields. Most presenters stick to a short presentation.
- I can now make stronger arguments for coordinating with or including property rights components in my development-focused food security work.
- Land and conflict, gender & vulnerable groups.
- Enjoyed the visual/storyline representation of the issues and linkages. Really informative and engaging! Video clips that showed real-life applications and implications of LTPR.
- Case studies were good, also hearing & seeing about actual projects.
- The virtual tour of Madagascar was very engaging/informative, PRADD video.
- The gender presentation, natural resources.
- Learned that a property rights/management unit exists in EGAT/Washington.
- On Madagascar & Haiti case study. John Bruce's presentation style was lively & engaging. Working with Amy Regas on Colombia & my team.
- Last module - understanding interactions in emerging issues.
- Defining constraints & interventions, modules, exchanging best practices, regional & country specific ideas, documentary/clips were excellent applicators.
- Peter Rabley - spatial data.
- Reading the case studies to see how these issues come up.
- Knowledge-acquiring. So, thanks.
- I really liked the case studies and some of the presentations were very informative, sure enough substantive info.
- Land security, land administration, land & conflict.
- Case studies (always more nuanced & instructive than generalizations), "lessons learned" from LTPR practitioners.
- The presentations were all excellent and full of valuable information. All the presenters were very well-informed and expressed the information clearly.
- Listening to specific examples from the field. Learning from other colleagues. Also, some of the presentations (most of them) were very good - concise, detailed and not too long! Way to go.

What topics (if any) would you have liked for us to have covered in greater detail?

Comments:

- More concrete examples, more practical application, more discussion.
- Infrastructure, more about water & water access rights.
- USAID success stories.
- some actual activities/interventions to illustrate ways to respond to these props.
- I felt the effects of secure tenure were well covered but not necessarily the causes. On conflict, transitional justice, & the role of HLP in conflict (as a weapon/tool) & also as a way to create inequities not really discussed. IDP/refugee's relationships - resettlement, compensation. Also, what are the components of a property rights system? And rights-based analysis.
- Application of tools, what is in the tool boxes.
- The philosophy of the course is that titling is NOT necessarily the answer and that customary law matters. How does one get security with customary law?

- How to program in this area. We learned about issues to consider, but not much about how interventions have/have not worked in different areas.
- I still didn't get quite enough detail, substantive depth on some of the presentation (gender/vulnerable populations, land administration, especially). But I would recommend a bit more depth on all first couple of days.
- Customary law.
- Customary law & systems.
- Natural resources.
- Land administration case studies.
- All topics were covered, but I would have preferred more technical intervention strategies and examples of what works and what doesn't in the field.

What topics (if any) did we spend too much time on?

Comments:

- The point & would like to get to tools of the trade.
- None – balance.
- If the presentations offered a little more depth (gender/vulnerable populations, land administration, especially) it would be great. The content was presented I would say didn't need the length but I would keep the time spent on it and give more technical depth.
- On segment on mapping/GIS.
- Too much time working in groups on case studies without enough technical information to come up with practical interventions.

Did you feel that the 3-day training course encompassing a broad array of themes was helpful, OR would you prefer that future course offerings be broken down into separate 1-day modules and participants attend the theme/module directly relevant to their area of interest?

Comments:

- Well prepared and organized and gave a great overview of the issues. Not too much, not too little in general.
- I liked this.
- I think that the three day training course was helpful because it gave us a broad view of the topics. It would be nice if there are short one day courses (or maybe online) in our area of interest to attend.
- Neither. I would actually condense the entire training into 2 days. However, I would recommend leaving all modules as a set because any land tenure work could impact any of these areas.
- It provided broad coverage of the issues.
- Because everything is inter-related feel that the broad array of themes was helpful to get a "flavor" and see how they operated together.
- To absorb.
- I would like to have modules on: 1) laws 2) titling 3) claims 4) spatial tools 5) urban areas - It is not necessary to explain "why" - more focus on "how."
- Nice broad range with appropriate time spent on each subject.
- I liked the broad array of themes. Liked learning about all the ones you covered.

- I like the way it is organized as you sometimes find that a module you weren't originally interested in is actually the best & most relevant.
- The way it is is good - officers need to be exposed to other disciplines & perspectives on such a cross-cutting issue.
- 3 day course was helpful. Separate modules are harder to schedule & themes are highly interrelated.
- I liked the comprehensive nature of the course. It was a good overview for a DG officer without specialization in this area.
- Ok as 3 day.
- 3 day package was good though the day could be reorganized.

How did you like the venue as a training facility?

Comments:

- Very good.
- Good – comfortable.
- Great.
- Lovely! Could not be nicer.
- Perfect.
- Great view, nice setup.
- Excellent food - should have been provided for all 3 days, great toys, but sound quality was awful.
- Nice.
- Loved the view, very convenient, audio was deplorable, room was too full and presenters at back distracting, breakouts were a little tough.

Have you ever rated a USAID course a perfect score (e.g. 5 out of 5)? If so, why?

Comments:

- As perfect, or close to that, because it was very useful bird's eye view.
- Sure. This one.
- This is the best AID course I have been too (have not rated other courses well).
- No, but many have come really close! Trainings provided by USAID employees have been particularly pertinent, impressive, engaging, creative & enjoyable.
- I try not to because I think it does not provide room for improvement.
- No.
- Very limited knowledge base, so it was all new info.
- No, but I've only taken a few courses.

Please provide any additional suggestions regarding how this training could be improved

Comments:

- Sales-pitchy at times.
- Everyone typically comes with a specific country or region of interest, would be great to incorporate a session where relevant issues in those areas could be brainstormed & discussed. Peer learning so trainers wouldn't necessarily have to know all the cases.

- Reduce presentations on first day to ease information overload,
- Day 1 needs to discuss what the end game for land titling is. Cannot accomplish land titling without formal recognition. Most countries USAID operates in have extremely weak judicial institutions.
- Don't kill us with power pt. Find other possible techniques.
- More case studies.
- The size of this group inhibited opportunities to participate in discussion.

We are considering developing an interactive distance learning version of the course to offer to those unable to attend the live classes. Would this be something you would recommend to your colleagues? If not, why not?

Comments:

- Maybe, often I find these to not be very interesting or informative, but in combo with the video clips could be a worthwhile idea.
- I am interested in the 5 day course.
- If this live one is not an option, sure. But I highly recommend the (your) live approach.
- I would.
- Better to go to the course, but I think the presentations would still be useful if they cannot attend in person.
- No- I'm interested in LTPR 2.0 course in Summer 2011.
- I am not a fan of this approach.
- Maybe.
- No - I find it hard to focus on PowerPoint (slide/lecture formats which are time-intensive & require tech hookup). For distance learning I'd by & far prefer a reading list! I would be interested in participating in LTPR 2.0.
- I would make it MUCH shorter and remove some of the overlap.

U.S. Agency for International Development

1300 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW

Washington, DC 20523

Tel: (202) 712-0000

Fax: (202) 216-3524

www.usaid.gov